

59200 (7/16/99)

WO

PFC/SEP/JKR

Rec'd PCT

06 DEC 2004

M

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITYTo:
JENNIFER K. ROSENFIELD
EDWARD & ANGELL, LLP
P.O. BOX 9169
BOSTON, MA 02209

RECEIVED

NOV 12 2004

EDWARD & ANGELL, LLP
IP DOCKETING DEPT. (BOS)

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION

(PCT Rule 66)

09 NOV 2004

Applicant's or agent's file reference 59200-PCT	Date of Mailing (day/month/year) REPLY DUE	within 2 months/days from the above date of mailing
International application No. PCT/US03/17903	International filing date (day/month/year) 06 June 2003 (06.06.2003)	Priority date (day/month/year) 06 June 2002 (06.06.2002)
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC IPC(7): H01J 40/14; H01J 31/50 and US Cl.: 250/214VT, 332, 339.02, 339.12, 339.14; 356/311		
Applicant THE JOHN HOPKINS UNIVERSITY		

1. This written opinion is the first (first, etc.) drawn by this International Preliminary Examining Authority.

2. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- I Basis of the opinion
- II Priority
- III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- IV Lack of unity of invention
- V Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2 (a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- VI Certain documents cited
- VII Certain defects in the international application
- VIII Certain observations on the international application

3. The applicant is hereby invited to reply to this opinion.

When? See the time limit indicated above. The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension. See rule 66.2(d).

How? By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.

Also For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4.

For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4 bis.

For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6.

If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.

4. The final date by which the international preliminary examination report must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: 06 October 2004 (06.10.2004).

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/US Mail Stop PCT, Attn: IPEA/US Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 Facsimile No. (703) 305-3230	Authorized officer Stephane B. Allen Telephone No. (571) 272-1550
---	---

Form PCT/IPEA/408 (cover sheet)(July 1998)

Rec'd PCT 06 DEC 2004

RECEIVED 06 DEC 2004

RE

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.

PCT/US03/17903

I. Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the elements of the international application:*

the international application as originally filed

the description:
pages 1-36, as originally filed
pages NONE, filed with the demand
pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____

the claims:
pages 37-41, as originally filed
pages NONE, as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19
pages NONE, filed with the demand
pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____

the drawings:
pages 1-12, as originally filed
pages NONE, filed with the demand
pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____

the sequence listing part of the description:
pages NONE, as originally filed
pages NONE, filed with the demand
pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____

2. With regard to the language, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language _____ which is:

the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).

the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).

the language of the translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3).

3. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, the written opinion was drawn on the basis of the sequence listing:

contained in the international application in printed form.

filed together with the international application in computer readable form.

furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.

furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.

The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.

The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.

4. The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

the description, pages NONE _____

the claims, Nos. NONE _____

the drawings, sheets/fig NONE _____

5. This opinion has been drawn as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).

* Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this opinion as "originally filed."

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.

PCT/US03/17903

III. Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

1. The question whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non-obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of:

the entire international application,
 claims Nos. 5-19 and 24-36

because:

the said international application, or the said claim Nos. _____ relate to the following subject matter which does not require international preliminary examination (*specify*):

the description, claims or drawings (*indicate particular elements below*) or said claims Nos. 5-19 and 24-36 are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (*specify*):

With respect to claims 5-19, a multiple dependent claim shall not serve as a basis for any other multiple dependent claim. PCT Rule 6.4 (a).

With respect to claims 24-36, any dependent claim (multiple dependent claim) shall refer to such other claims in alternative only and a multiple dependent claim shall not serve as a basis for any other multiple dependent claim. PCT Rule 6.4 (a).

the claims, or said claims Nos. _____ are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed.
 no international search report has been established for said claims Nos. _____.

2. A written opinion cannot be drawn due to the failure of the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing to comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions:

the written form has not been furnished or does not comply with the standard.
 the computer readable form has not been furnished or does not comply with the standard.

WRITTEN OPINIONInternational application No.
PCT/US03/17903**V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement****1. STATEMENT**

Novelty (N)	Claims <u>NONE</u>	YES
	Claims <u>1-4 and 20-23</u>	NO
Inventive Step (IS)	Claims <u>NONE</u>	YES
	Claims <u>1-4 AND 20-23</u>	NO
Industrial Applicability (IA)	Claims <u>1-4 AND 20-23</u>	YES
	Claims <u>NONE</u>	NO

2. CITATIONS AND EXPLANATIONS

Claims 1-4 and 20-23 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,758,778 to Braunlich.

With respect to claims 20-23, Braunlich discloses a visual converter device comprising an electro-optical device that is sensitive to light in a specific wavelength range and configured to intensify light in this wavelength range focused on its input face to an image that can be directly visualized at the output face; and a housing that minimizes external stray light from being observed at the output face of the electro-optical device.

With respect to claims 1-4, the method for microscopic visualization of a sample is inherent in the device disclosed with respect to claims 20-23 above.

----- NEW CITATIONS -----

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.
PCT/US03/17903

Supplemental Box
(To be used when the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient)

TIME LIMIT:

The time limit set for response to a Written Opinion may not be extended. 37 CFR 1.484(d). Any response received after the expiration of the time limit set in the Written Opinion will not be considered in preparing the International Preliminary Examination Report.